

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_124952
Title of the Manuscript:	Removal of residual phosphorus and nitrates from sewage treatment plants by a fine sand filter
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presented an interesting topic that has the potential to address the persistent issues of water pollution which makes the study so timely and crucial.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract needs improvement. It is suggested that the breakthrough results from this application be included in the abstract. What were the initial values of phosphorous and nitrate before the application of sand bed filtration and what are the values after?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Some issues need to be generally checked especially grammatical. The use of well-defined statistical tools makes the study robust in addition, the study focused on addressing global issues.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor improvement is required.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Reviewer's comments.</p> <p>The study on <i>“Removal of residual phosphorus and nitrates from sewage treatment plants by a fine sand filter”</i> has presented an interesting result. I enjoyed reading it; however, the authors should address the following comments.</p> <p>Specific comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is suggested that the breakthrough results from this application be included in the abstract. What were the initial values of phosphorous and nitrate before the application of sand bed filtration and what are the values after? 2. It is suggested that a thorough grammar check on the manuscript be done to improve the overall language of the manuscript and be consistent with the spaces between characters of the manuscript. 3. The abbreviations contained in the manuscript were not defined which makes the understanding of the concepts so difficult. I suggest that abbreviations that are not standard be defined. 4. Wastewater is written as a single word not separated. Kindly check through the manuscript and effect the corrections in addition to the general grammar check. 5. The breakthrough results from this process should also be part of the conclusion. <p>Final Decision</p> <p>I strongly recommend the publication of this manuscript after the authors have addressed the issues raised.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Matthew Adah Onu</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Johannesburg, South Africa</p>